

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/719,770	11/21/2003	Stewart J. Lebrun	MGENE.016A	MGENE.016A 3300	
20995 7	590 07/20/2006	EXAMINER			
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET			YANG, NELSON C		
FOURTEENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA 92614			1641		
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/20/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 07/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	ition No.	Applicant(s)	_		
Office Action Summary		10/719	,770	LEBRUN, STEWART J.			
		Examir	er	Art Unit	_		
		Nelson	_	1641			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication appears on	he cover sheet with the d	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAISING OF	MAILING DATE OF s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. tatutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICATION event, however, may a reply be tire will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <i>21 Novembei</i>	2003.				
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to							
٠,٥	closed in accordance with the pract		•				
Dispositi	on of Claims	·					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the	application.					
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restrict	ion and/or election i	equirement.				
·	on Papers		•				
	•	o Eveniner					
-	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are		h) abjected to by the	Evaminer			
10)[_]	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *						
	Applicant may not request that any objection	- ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·			
11\	Replacement drawing sheet(s) includin The oath or declaration is objected to	-					
•	·	o by the Examiner.	Note the attached Office	ACTION OF IOTHER TO-132.			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies	of the priority docu	ments have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
	application from the Internation	•					
* S	See the attached detailed Office action	on for a list of the ce	rtified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)			4) Interview Summary				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:							

Application/Control Number: 10/719,770 Page 2

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-12, 18-20, drawn to a protein microarray, classified in class 435, subclass 287.1.
 - II. Claims 13-16, drawn to a method of screening for rheumatoid arthritis, classified in class 435, subclass 4.
 - III. Claim 17, drawn to a method of treating rheumatoid arthritis, classified in class 424, subclass 1.17.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
- 3. Inventions I and II; III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the protein microarray can be used for removing or separating analytes from a sample, or for use as a selective adhesive. Furthermore, the method of group III cannot be performed using the apparatus of group I.
- 4. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the method of group II is directed toward screening for rheumatoid arthritis and requires detecting of antibody binding, while the

*

method of group III is directed toward treating rheumatoid arthritis, and requires administration of a composition.

Page 3

- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter

Art Unit: 1641

of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted

after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brower* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson Yang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,770

Art Unit: 1641

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on (571)272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson Yang Patent Examiner Art Unit 1641

> LONG V. LE 57/14/06 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Page 5